

*These letters were written by Doctor Thomas
Jebb, Master of St. John's Hospital, &c.
& are very valuable.*

*Dr. Jebb died a few years after the publication
of these letters, his wife & daughters have preserved
from Mr. Croxon as a reward for the honest mention of
Gourmands* THE *Al*

*Shew that Jebb is here being a doctor
the doctor*

LETTERS

OF

GUATIMOZIN, &c.



col-b
THE
LETTERS

OF
GUATIMOZIN, *

ON THE
AFFAIRS OF IRELAND,

AS FIRST PUBLISHED IN THE
FREEMAN'S JOURNAL,
AND WHICH
HAVING BEEN SINCE RE-PRINTED IN LONDON,
HAVE GONE THROUGH SEVERAL EDITIONS THERE.

TO WHICH ARE ADDED, THE
LETTERS
OF
CAUSIDICUS,

THAT ACCOMPANIED THE
ESSAYS OF GUATIMOZIN
IN THEIR
FIRST APPEARANCE.

D U B L I N:
PRINTED BY R. MARCHBANK,
AND SOLD BY ISAAC COLLES,
No. 33, CAPEL-STREET,

M D C C L X I I

Apr 1862



"Day by day, the Mexicans, forced to retire
"as the Spaniards gained ground, were hemmed
"in within more narrow limits. GUATIMOZIN,
"though unable to stop the career of the enemy,
"continued to defend his capital with obstinate
"resolution, and disputed every inch of ground.
"—He rejected, with scorn, every overture of
"peace from CORTES, and, disdaining the idea of
"submitting to the oppressors of his country, de-
"termined not to survive its ruin."

Robertson's Hist. of America, V. II. B. 5th.

PRINTED BY
AND SOLD BY
NO. 10, CUPPER-STREET.
NEWCASTLE

for the purpose of...
designated for...
revoked...
of...
be...
LETTERS
...
...
...
...
GUATIMOZIN, &c.

...
...
...
TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING
THE FREE-PRESS.

LETTER I.
To the PEOPLE of IRELAND, in general, and of
the CITY of DUBLIN in particular.

COUNTRYMEN, AND FELLOW-CITIZENS,

THERE is in the affairs of nations, as of individuals, a tide, or current, which sometimes sets in towards the harbour of good-fortune, and the occasion of which, being once missed, is never perhaps recalled. Such, with regard to Ireland, do I conceive the present moment to be. During a space of nearly six hundred years, that she hath been united to an unnatural sister, she has experienced

rienced nothing but adversity and opposition; in-
 much that the measure of her misfortunes will not
 now contain another. The rapacity of England
 over Ireland hath received its limits in the pover-
 ty of this country; there is not left wherewithal to
 gratify the avarice of another Englishman, ruined
 at home by the luxury and dissipation of his own
 country. The weight of that establishment, which
 British wantonness has encreased without necessity,
 in this ill-fated country, must now be supported by
British resources; for an exhausted treasury, and an
 universally-failing revenue, have proclaimed us un-
 equal to the burden.

A trade limited to the exportation of a single
 manufacture, whilst it forbids us to profit of the
 most unbounded advantages, which nature, perhaps,
 ever bestowed on any country, binds us likewise in
 the necessity of consuming, even for our own use,
 the manufactures of our tyrants, to whom knack and
 universal markets have given a general superiority.
 'Tis thus that England in the extravagance of her
 oppression of this kingdom, not only precludes us
 from the opportunities of gathering sustenance, with
 the other nations of Europe, from the common
 harvest of commerce, but she compels us, miser-
 able as we are, to contribute largely to her pro-
 fusion.

If any man shall say that this slight sketch of our
 condition is a *caricature*, let the thousands of starv-
 ing manufacturers in our streets bear witness that
 the *drawing* is after nature. The misfortunes of
 Ireland are lamented by all her children; how
 comes it then that there is none will point out a
 remedy? Is the spirit of the nation so broken by
 adversity,

adversity, that our feelings suggest nothing but despair? I hope not; and it is in confidence of this hope, that I mean to dedicate some hours *weekly*, to this subject. If the conductors of the Free-Press, will give me a corner, I intend, (God willing) every Saturday, to publish an essay, until I shall have roused my countrymen, universally to a sense of their condition, or convinced myself, that the expectation is vain. I will not apply the *match* to the *tinder*, which I hope lies concealed in the breast of every virtuous Irishman; before I shall have convinced his reason. My first appeal shall be to the judgment.

That I may proceed with method, and be therefore the more easily understood by my fellow-citizens of every class, I will in this essay lay down, as ground-work, the general principles on which I mean to take up the subject; and I request that each essay may be preserved as links of the same chain.

First, I will enquire by what means any one nation may become entitled to controul over another. Secondly, by what right England claims this authority over Ireland. Thirdly, I will endeavour to do away some objections, raised by prejudice, and ignorance of the true interests of Ireland, against the expediency of our emancipation; and lastly, I will demonstrate that the present moment is the most favourable that probably we shall ever experience for doing ourselves justice.

And first, the *imperial sovereignty* of any one kingdom over another, *de jure*, is DIRECT NON-SENSE. The government of a country can only

be transferred two ways, by the consent of its inhabitants, or by conquest. If a nation consents to be governed, it must be under terms *stipulated*; and in this case the municipal constitution of such country will be *precisely* regulated by the terms of agreement. Here it is necessary to recollect certain principles in the nature of all government—first, that no race of men can alienate, by any act of theirs, the liberty of their posterity; and again, that the delegation or transfer of power must be for the advantages of the *governed*, else it is *ipso facto*, void. Thus we see that no sacrifice of the interests of one nation to those of another, can exist, even by its own consent. Let us now examine the right of subordination obtained by conquest.

If the conquerors of a nation invade it *unjustly*, surely they have no claim to authority over the conquered. If a Russian violently, with a pistol at a man's head, shall obtain a conveyance of his estate, doth such usurpation constitute right? Such exactly is the title of those who conquer *unjustly*; and it is the duty of the injured to recover their rights, when they can. But the conquerors of a country have invaded it, we will suppose, to recover their violated rights; and their opposers are in the wrong; how far does this constitute a right in the *conquerors* over the liberty and property of the *conquered*? I apprehend not at all. The lives of such persons taking up arms against rightful authority, may, no doubt, be fairly taken away; but their crime will not forfeit the liberty of their posterity, *which is unalienable*; nor their property, which nature appointed to sustain their unoffending children. These distinctions we shall find very necessary,

cessary, when I shall, in my next enquire by what right England claims controul over Ireland.

For the present, my dear countrymen, I will bid you adieu. Permit me to request that you will carefully peruse these papers. Continue the connection of reasoning from one Essay to the next, and decide at last upon your own rights. If I shall be able to bring my fellow-citizens to unite in one common interest, and to pursue one scheme of obtaining redress, I shall hope that the nation will derive some advantage from the labours of

16th April,
1779.

GUATIMOZIN.

**TOTAL COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING
IN THE FREE-PRESS.**

LETTER II.

*To the PEOPLE of IRELAND in general, and the
CITY of DUBLIN in particular.*

COUNTRYMEN, AND FELLOW CITIZENS,

I FIND, that my letter, published last Saturday, has raised an host of opponents; who, alarmed at the consequences of investigating our independent national rights, as IRISHMEN, would willingly stop all enquiry, by the interposition of the single cabalistical word REBELLION.

The

The immediate effect of the discovery of the Art of Printing in Europe, was the emancipation of the laity from ecclesiastical *ipse dixitism*; and, a more remote, tho' not less substantial, benefit to society arose from the diffusion of political knowledge, which enabled all men of reasonable capacity to understand their civil rights; and qualified the inhabitants of *these* countries, in particular, to vindicate the title of every citizen to expound the constitution;—a privilege exclusively exercised before by lawyers, who had too frequently the temptation of *leaning towards the prerogative*. Thus the circulation of knowledge produced civil and religious liberty; and hence, to reason inversely, may ignorance be said to be the parent of slavery.

I find that a certain Judge, for whose opinions in general I have very great respect, did yesterday, from the judgment-seat deliver something like a declaration that there was an *illegal tendency* in our *present efforts*;—throwing some blame on grand juries for the extent of their enquiries; and circumscribing within bounds limited by *his own explanation* of the grand jurors duty, the objects of their public attention and care.

Authorities, in constitutional questions, I think, in general are dangerous; and, where an authority is unsupported by *reasoning* and *facts*, I am always for rejecting it.

Grand Juries being composed of the principal men of the county, assembled twice a year, for public inquest, I cannot comprehend any misfortune of the country, of a public nature, which will not constitutionally come within their investigation.—Clear I am that a *constitutional Judge* will
always

always wish to enlarge the scene of their vigilancy. —Much mischief may arise from limiting their enquiry :—none, that I can see, from extending it. The bulk of the people are generally right, and particularly when they discover abuses.—But these associations, it seems, in favour of our own manufactures, and in exclusion of those of Great Britain, are *illegal combinations*; and the news-papers are *seditious*, for recommending and spreading them.—I will not be bound to the belief of this doctrine by the *authority of any man*—It is the privilege of a subject, living under the British constitution to act, to speak, and to publish every thing which is not forbidden by law; and, till the illegality of combining, in favour of our own manufactures, shall be unquestionably demonstrated, I will take the liberty to reject all *assertional* doctrine upon this head, and to put my fellow citizens on their guard against the ill-tendency of such.—Whenever any man shall be disposed to discuss the question publicly, I will enter the lists with him; nor do I think it will, in the smallest degree, lessen the dignity of any person amongst us, to defend publicly a doctrine, which is intended to have a public operation.—We have known a lawyer raise himself in this country to the judgment seat, by the means of a *prerogative pamphlet* only:—A news-paper essay is a shorter kind of pamphlet, and is, in my opinion, full as respectable authority for the conveyance of any doctrine.

But, to come to the subject of the connection of this kingdom with England, from the investigation of which no authority shall affright me. I proved, generally, in my last letter, that no country can, *de jure*, exercise *imperial sovereignty* over another.

I will

* Mr. J—e R—b—n.

I will now examine the *justice* of the claim of ENGLAND, in particular, over THIS country.

If a title to INDEPENDANCE may be derived from *antiquity*, we have the clearest preference in favour of this country, by an historical anecdote of a dispute for *precedence*, at the Council of Constance, 1417, between the legates of Charles VI. of France, and those of Henry V. of England. The legates of Henry prevailed on account of the antiquity of the kingdom of Ireland, of which their master was *sovereign*. But, at this day, people require clearer proofs of independance; and those shall be established on the nature of the two kingdoms.

That the title of the King of England to the crown of Ireland is not derived from *conquest* is a question of little or no doubt. It stands, thank God, upon a much *firmer basis*, THE CONSENT OF THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND. But, if Henry the Second's title had originated in *conquest*, how far does this constitute the right of jurisdiction in the British Parliament? Not at all. The Parliament of Ireland is as compleat in its own jurisdiction, as is the Parliament of England; and the King of Ireland may be the King of England, King of France, or Emperor of Germany, without any prejudice to the separate jurisdiction of the Irish Parliament.

The power of conquerors is limited by certain laws, drawn from the nature of civil rights, and digested into a system called the *law of nations*; and, from the whole spirit of these it appears, that PRESERVATION, not *servitude*, is the end of conquest. A conquest may destroy *national injustice*,

injustice, and lay the conquered under a better ge-
nius of government: but the law of nations, which
limits the authority of conquerors, forbids that
a nation be made worse by conquest. The defi-
nition of the right of conquest, by one of the great-
est authorities extant, may not be amiss here. "It
is," says Montesquieu, "a necessary, lawful,
but unhappy power, which leaves the conqueror
under an heavy obligation of repairing injuries
done to humanity." In short, conquest can
rightfully give a King no other advantages but an
addition of subjects, whom it is his duty to pro-
tect, and who should be governed according to the
principles of their own laws, or by better, with
their consent. And thus were the words superior
and inferior, with regard to countries connected
under the same government, understood by those
universal conquerors the Romans, in their virtu-
ous days. CICERO says, lib. ii. cap. viii. de Officiis,
"Nostri autem magistratus imperatoresque ex hac una
re maximam laudem capere studebant, si provincias, si
socios equitate et fide defendissent. Itaque illud Pa-
TROCIINIUM orbis terræ verius, quam IMPERIUM, po-
terat nominari." And so the Carthaginians un-
derstood conquest; as we find in TIT. LIV. lib.
xii. cap. v. speaking of the Olcadians, a people of
Spain reduced by Carthage, "Ultra Iberum sa-
gens in PARTE magis, quam in DITIONE Cartha-
ginienfium erat."

If the peaceful reception of STRONGBOW into
 this kingdom, and the subsequent acquisition of
 regal authority here by Henry II. may be called
 conquest, we see, however, that the power of the
 King in Ireland cannot exceed the bounds of his
 power in England. And we shall find that the
 claim

claim of the British Parliament over this country is a novel usurpation, not justified, as we see above, by any right of a conquering people, if they even came under this description, nor authorised, as we shall see further, by the conditions of union stipulated by the Irish, and granted to them by the first Norman Kings of Ireland. MAT. PARIS (Vit. Hen. II.) informs us, that Henry, before he left Ireland, met a council of the Irish at Lismore, where, having settled the constitution of Ireland, the Irish received and swore to be governed by the laws of England. This seems to be the true cause why Henry received no opposition in Ireland. The Irish received a better government, and retained their independency; and therefore PARIS uses the expression *gratanter receptæ*, speaking of the English laws. *Giraldus Cambrensis*, who was with Henry in Ireland, informs us, that by the terms stipulated at submission, the people of Ireland were to enjoy the like liberties and immunities, and be governed by the same mild laws, both civil and ecclesiastical, as the people of England. Here is the only voluntary original compact, between King and people, truly and formally authenticated, of which our history gives an instance. We do not find that the British parliament, or its authority, was concerned or consulted in this agreement. There was nothing but the *Regia Sublimitatis Autoritas* on the one part, and the good-will of the people on the other; as the Irish statute the 11th Eliz. c. 1. expresses it.

Very soon after this agreement between Henry II. and the people of Ireland, he transmitted to them the *Modus tenendi parliamentum*, which Modus

See Stat. of 11
Elizth - chap 1

is said to have been a copy of that given by William the conqueror to the English. The original of the Irish Modus was extant at the Revolution; and its authenticity cannot be questioned; for it was exemplified by an *insperimus* under the Great Seal of Ireland, in the reign of Henry IV. Regulated by this Modus, were Parliaments held in Ireland under Henry II.—And in about five years afterwards, in a parliament held at Oxford, Henry created his youngest son John, King of Ireland. This makes a remarkable epoch in the history of Irish independence. For this alienation of the Crown of Ireland, from the person of the King of England, rendered Ireland as completely independent of England, supposing all the rights of conquest, &c. to have been then in force, as if the two kingdoms had never been connected.

John, then very young, took immediate possession, exercising all regal powers, amongst which are divers grants and charters, by which alone, at this Day, the corporation of the City of Dublin enjoys franchises and privileges. He remained King of this country, separately, during a space of twenty-two years, in which time there does not appear a single instance of the interference of the Crown of England. After the death of his father, and that of his elder brother Richard I. who died without issue, the crown of England devolved upon John, by accidental inheritance. But if Richard had left issue, who would have inherited the crown of England, surely the crown of Ireland had remained in the issue of John, and Ireland would be at this day a kingdom, separated from England in every respect whatsoever.

Henry

See rights
of Henry 4.

See the
Reign of
H. 1st

Henry III. who succeeded his father John in the government of both kingdoms, granted to Ireland a Magna Charta, which is preserved in the *Red Book* of the Exchequer, in the first year of his reign, eight years before he granted the Magna Charta of England, and the one is a copy of the other. In February following he granted, by another charter, to the Irish all the liberties granted by him and his father to the English.

What are the liberties of Englishmen? To be governed by LAWS to which they have given consent, either by themselves, or their Representatives in Parliament. Have the Irish consented to the several British acts, by which they are now restrained? If the kings of England had retained their dominion of France, would the English submit to be bound by laws made at Paris? I should be glad to have this last question answered by the British Parliament. But in short we are to understand that liberty means one thing in England, and in Ireland another.

The parliamentary independency of Ireland, confirmed by three several establishments in the reign of the three first Kings of Ireland of the Norman race, remained pure and chaste, down to the year 1641, when the exceeding confusion of the government in Ireland, and the impossibility of holding a parliament there, laid the foundation of a precedent, which was monstrously built upon in the reign of Charles II. The act of navigation, and the act against the exportation of wool, save only to England, are usurpations upon this country, not founded in justice or reason; and for which I never heard an Englishman offer
any

any other justification, than that which will as well
 fit an highwayman; viz.—*the law of force imposed
 by a strong hand*, and even now doubtless to answer

I should never have done, if I were to quote
 the infinite examples, during a space of five hun-
 dred years, drawn from our own and the English
 statutes, of the separate and independent jurisdic-
 tion of the Irish Parliament. The common law of
 England became, by the stipulations between
 Henry II. and the Irish people, the law of Ireland.
 Whensoever a new law was enacted in England,
 (for, take notice, they have no statute law before the
 time of Henry III.) if it was found expedient for
 Ireland, it became immediately the object of the
 Irish Parliament, and then, but not before it was
 passed by them, became a law here. I defy the
 most enthusiastic stickler for the supremacy of the
 British Parliament to shew a single instance con-
 tradictory of this assertion. The mode of appeal,
 by writ of error, to the King's Bench in England,
 from the King's Bench here, is no exception.
 When an Irish subject appeals from an erroneous
 judgment here, altho' he goes into the Court of
 King's Bench in England, he does not apply to
 any part of the political government of England
 for redress. He applies to the King of Ireland
 in *Curia Domini Regis*; and if the King, with
 whom the Court always travels, were resident
 here, appeals would equally come from England.
 The same may be said of Chancery, because the
 Chancellor did always follow the King, as the
 King's Bench did. The appeal to the Lords of
 England, in the last resort, was established by a
 British Act of Parliament, (6th Geo. I.) and is
 justified only by the law of force,

Thus,

Thus, my countrymen, have I proved the violence offered to your most sacred right, of living under laws, enacted, or consented to by yourselves. Rights of which you have been in possession for above five hundred years after your connection with England, and without the enjoyment of which your constitution is politically dead. The age of your tyranny does not greatly exceed a century — that it may not live to be much older, is the sincere wish of

April 22.

GUATIMOZIN.

TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING
THE FREE-PRESS.

LETTER III.

To the PEOPLE of IRELAND, in general, and of
the CITY of DUBLIN in particular.

COUNTRYMEN, AND FELLOW-CITIZENS,

WHENCE comes it, that in comparisons which call forth the exertions of human pride, a rank is settled in Europe for an Englishman above that of an Irishman? And, why is it, that the men of this country seem to admit, at least by a negative consent, the justice of the decision? Is the superiority conceded upon a fair comparison of their relative qualities? Doth the man, born on the east of the Irish Channel, inherit from his climate

mate a better constitution of mind or of body ? Stands his frame upon two more gracefully useful columns ? And has providence ornamented him with a more beautiful tincture of skin, or a more commanding form of countenance ? Is an Irishman less patient of the infirmities of climate ? Or, finds he in his breast a heart less susceptible of love, or of courage ?

Habits of thinking, my dear countrymen ! have more than realized these distinctions.—Political inferiority hath for a length of time, so sunk our spirit, that we find in us no inclination to examine our own value, or to question the power which holds us in enchantment. The same spirit of sorcery, which hath fitted the *descendants of the ancient SPARTANS* to become the *mutilated guardians of the pleasures of a Despot in a Seraglio*, and which makes the *offspring of the DECII and HORATII* at this day content with the fame of being the first fiddlers in Europe, is operating fatally upon the inhabitants of IRELAND.

If men *will* think themselves inferior, they will certainly become so ; and usurpations upon their various rights will inevitably follow. The people of England improve all the advantages of superiority, which our folly, *of admitting the fact*, makes easy to them. Our very pronunciation of their language becomes an object of their reproach, and, by comparison, of our inferiority ; a language, which, considering its complex nature, and its migration, could not be supposed to keep exact pace with its progress in the native country, except by a *Babylonish miracle*.

It

It is the peculiar misfortune of this country, that all the inhabitants of it do not agree in the means of making it better. Views of separate interests, diligently held up to different parties by our political neighbours, divide the people of this kingdom into factions. If, upon the present occasion, men will not give up their narrow prejudices, and co-operate universally for *the one thing needful*, my labours, and the wishes of the most virtuous patriots among us, will nothing avail. But, if the spirit which has lately gone abroad, shall operate generally; and if men of all denominations in the kingdom shall unite against the common oppressor, no doubt can be entertained of success.

Fortunately our condition exempts us from the necessity of doing such things for our deliverance, as our tyrants would call **REBELLION**. We have only to unite in the plain system of *consenting EXCLUSIVELY, the manufactures of this country*, and the work is done. It is time to exhibit one public act of national wisdom; and I hope we shall not forego the gratification of public revenge, merely because the means of obtaining it are *nationally wise*.

In my former letters, I established upon a rock firm as the foundation of the earth, the imperiality of this kingdom, and the usurpation of the Parliament of Great Britain upon the rights of our own, by a strong and lawless hand. My present attention will be confined to the prejudices which prevail with regard to the expediency of our **EMANCIPATION**.

I know

I know that there are amongst us many well-meaning people, who entertain apprehensions on account of the comparative power of England—and I know, that there are likewise amongst us many Scotchmen, Englishmen, Revenue Officers, &c. &c. who fail not to improve those fears to the prejudice of our cause.—It is, therefore, to people labouring under such terrors my present letter is directed.

The whole of the arguments against our emancipation, turns upon three points. The ability of England to crush us in an active way; the danger of immediate ruin to Ireland, should the people of England confine their retaliation to a resolution not to take our *linens*; and the danger we incur of being swallowed up by other nations of Europe, should England withdraw her protection. As to the power of England, I cannot comprehend why it should be directed against us, on account of our intention of consuming only our own manufactures. The King who is the executive authority in England, by which alone the sword of war is unsheathed, will surely recollect that the kingdom of Ireland is entitled to his protection as much as England, and his Majesty is too just to make war, even upon strangers, without cause. But what have we to dread from the power of England, if it were let loose upon us? The English are not yet as cruel as the New Zealanders, they will not devour Irishmen. But they will surround our coasts with fleets, and cut off our trade. Even let them do so. A shot from a ship will not kill a man half a mile from the coast; this kingdom abounds in all the necessaries of life, within itself; and as to trade, there is nothing we can part with more easily, for they have taken care to teach us to live

C

without

without it. I fancy, my dear countrymen, the English have got very few ships or men to spare for an Irish war. The Scotch Fencibles seem to have, at present, very little appetite for foreign expeditions; and if the English have not learned some prudence from their Trans-Atlantic misfortunes, they are more perverse, and less wise than I believed they were. England has too great a stake to risque upon the event of a war with Ireland. I think the most moderate calculations state the advantages she has by this country at two millions annually, which I believe is more than she makes by the remainder of the Globe. Can she now afford to lose so much? A wise agent would advise her to compromise the suit, rather than abide the issue. Besides, will the powers of Europe have no interest in breaking down the strength of England, by setting Ireland free? The answer to this question should make England tremble. The idea of compelling Ireland to submit to England by force of arms, is wicked nonsense. Ruin to the empire would inevitably follow the first effort of hostility; and this alone, I hope, is sufficient to quiet the alarms of people here on this score.

As to the danger we incur of being swallowed up by some neighbouring state, in case England should withdraw her protection, it is a foolish bugbear. We run infinitely more risque of being invaded by the enemies of Great-Britain, in the time of her wars, from which we derive perpetual loss but no advantage, than we should do upon our own account, if we led peaceably a separate life. Were we removed from English influence, we should grow rich as Holland has done, and
we

we should be as much secured from the effects of general malice, as the inhabitants of that country were, when they shook off the Spanish yoke. The balance of Europe would preserve this country free, if it were once set loose. The influence of each particular state would keep it out of the attraction of any one in particular; and the whole would be highly gratified in the downfall of **PROUD ENGLAND.**

The enquiry, my dear countrymen, into the probable danger to our linen-manufacture, from our present associations, I shall reserve for my next, as I find it would trespass too much on your patience, as well as upon the toleration of the Committee of the Free-Press, to prosecute the subject this day.

I confess that, as an Irishman, I feel considerable gratification in the checks, which the progress of England's usurpations hath received in America. There was a period in the Roman intoxication, when the citizens of Rome paid no taxes whatsoever. After the conquest of Macedonia, the whole burden of the State was imposed upon the conquered countries, and then it was that the provinces looked upon the loss of the liberty of Rome, as the epoch of their own freedom.

April 30.

GUATIMOZIN:

**TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING
THE FREE-PRESS.**

LETTER IV.

*To the PEOPLE of IRELAND, in general, and of
the CITY of DUBLIN in particular.*

COUNTRYMEN, AND FELLOW-CITIZENS,

A PERIODICAL author, whose intention in writing is to benefit the society he lives amongst, by opening their eyes upon the true objects of their prosperity and happiness, will find perpetual advantage from the concealment of his name: the public judgment concerning his productions will receive no influence from the peculiar infirmities or advantages of his personal character, and the freedom of the general opinion will direct his future attention to the removal of such prejudices as operate against the conviction of the people.

I find that the authority of great names, among us, still keeps alive a kind of apprehension that our associations in favour of our own manufactures are not strictly justifiable. In general answer to which, I beg leave to ask, if the whole policy of the English commerce be not founded upon the same principle? Is there a single manufacture of Great Britain which is not doubly entrenched in *prohibitory importation* laws?—And shall the same act be illegal in the people of Ireland, which is constitutional

constitutional in those of England? Is *blundering* so powerfully operative in our climate, that a measure which, in England, is wise and legal, shall in our hands become wicked and inexpedient?

But, say those very cautious authorities, you may buy and consume Irish manufactures if you choose; it is the declaration of combining which is found fault with. In the first place, there can be no *illegality*, in combining to *do* that, which, from its own nature, may *legally* be *done*. But, this act of *moderation* is intended to break down our whole scheme; for every man in Ireland has long known, and, individually, lamented the phrenzy of consuming foreign manufactures to the discouragement of our own; yet should we have gone on in the same course, to the end, if the inevitable ruin consequent of the evil, and the insulting neglect of England at this time, had not drove us to the present spirit of GENERAL ASSOCIATION, as the only means of relief for our own people, and of punishment to our oppressors.—Happy, that the same peaceable tenor of conduct shall encompass two great purposes, so different in their kind, and so desirable in their end! As long as this patriotic flame shall be kept alive, success is indubitable; but, if, by any sophistry, the enemies of our national prosperity shall be able to extinguish it, we will be found to relapse into our antient, lethargic malady, rendered more obstinate by having been in vain attempted to be cured. The FIRMNESS of the CONFEDERACY only can SAVE us; and that will very much depend on the warmth of our zeal.

Great

Great offence, I find, my dear countrymen, has been affected to be taken, on account of a declaration in my last letter, that, *I rejoiced in the checks which England had received in America.* I am far from retracting the sentiment. I cannot see any cause of joy to this country in the extension of British aggrandizement. If there were no hopes left us of successful resistance to the control exercised over this kingdom by the usurpation of the Parliament of Great Britain; and, if we had evidence that it was the fixed decree of fate that we should always remain in our present slavery;—I say, it is the duty of a virtuous Irishman to wish to see the British constitution destroyed, and the King of England absolute: because the condition of an Irishman would be bettered by the change.

Let us summarily consider what is the present form of constitution in Ireland:—Like that of our sister kingdom, it consists generally of a legislative power, and an executive one. They are severally absolute in their operation, in each kingdom; and should be so, in order to render them effectual. The legislative power in England consists of the two orders of the inhabitants; and every thing intended to pass into a law, must originate either from the Lords or Commons of England:—so that the PEOPLE suggest the legislative rules under which they are content to live; and the rigorous exercise of the executive authority, with regard to those laws, seems but to invigorate and give operation to their commands. Such, likewise, was the constitution of Ireland, from the time of its submission to the crown of England, till it became altered and debased in the reign of Henry VII. by the effect

*Payne's Law.
in Henry 7th*

fect of Poynings' law. Since that period, the legislative authority in Ireland remains despoiled of its most inestimable attribute, the ORIGINATION OF LAWS. It is now the inverse of the British legislation; and, in effect resembles much more the French Parliament, into which the King's edicts come down to be registered, before they become laws.

Such is our legislative power in Ireland :—But, behold, what is our executive power! It is a MONSTER, consisting of the *King of Ireland*, and the *Parliament of Great Britain*! Can any Irishman hesitate in a choice between being a colonist of an absolute King of England, and remaining a subject of such a perverted government as is described above?—A government always the more intolerable, by comparing it with one to which we are equally entitled with our fellow-subjects of England. A People subject to the will of an absolute Prince, have nothing to gratify but the passions of *one man*; and colonies at a distance from such government are, in general, mildly administered. But who can undertake to please *so many masters* as we have got in the Parliament of Great Britain, whose interest consists in the means of our poverty and distress!

But I will withdraw from a scene which exhibits nothing to us but confusion and reproach; and I will endeavour to dispatch the subject I promised for this day, namely, *the probable danger to our linen manufacture, from our present association*. Say the advocates for the imperiality of the British Parliament, “If you shall continue to refuse the manufactures of Great Britain, you will compel

compel the people of Great Britain to retaliate, and you will lose the *only* market you have for the *only* commodity you can manufacture." This subject deserves consideration; and, enveloped as it is in obscurity and difficulty, I will endeavour to throw some light upon it; which, though it may not clearly shew all the parts of it, may yet serve to direct others of my countrymen in the true line of enquiry.

By the accounts laid before the British Parliament within a few years, I find that the quantity of all the linen brought into England, annually, amounted in value to about three millions sterling, of which a million and a half was paid for foreign linen, about a million for Irish, and about half a million for that which came from Scotland. I think it is pretty generally understood that England herself manufactures between checks, huckabacks, &c. &c. for about the value of as much as she imports. Now let us just consider the proportion which *the great linen manufacture of Ireland* bears to the whole of this. It makes about one-sixth part. I dare say there are many very sensible people in this country, who, having never enquired into the fact, imagined their obligations to Great Britain, upon this head, much greater than they really are; and who did not doubt but the people of England were supplied principally from Ireland with all articles of linen, denying themselves the advantages of going into the manufacture, or of dealing with strangers for it, *merely to benefit us.*

Two questions arise now naturally out of the subject.—First, Why does not Ireland, exclusively,

freely, supply the whole, to the advantages of which she seems entitled by the condition of her agreement with England, when she gave up her woollen manufacture? And, 2dly, Is there not great apprehension that England will contrive to supply herself with our sixth part of the manufacture, from the source whence she obtains the other five? To the first, I answer, that undoubtedly Ireland should be at this day, if she had been honourably dealt by, in possession of the exclusive trade to England, and its appendages, in all articles of linen. But the want of due encouragement to the Irish manufacture on the part of Great Britain, has limited it almost to one province in the kingdom; whilst a fostering hand has cherished it in Great Britain, and, the neglect of having suffered the duty upon foreign linens to come down to almost nothing, has given a preference to the Germans in the English market. By explaining simply the last part of this assertion, I shall nearly clear up the whole.

When Ireland accepted of the linen trade, with which she was totally unacquainted, in exchange for a woollen manufacture in which she had made great progress, the Parliament of England agreed to load the foreign linens at importation with a duty of nearly 30 per cent. and to grant a bounty upon the exportation from England of our Irish linens, from one halfpenny to three halfpence per yard.—The Dutch were, at that day, possessed of the linen manufacture; and the duty was laid upon their linens of every kind. The Germans and the Russians manufactured at the same time a very inconsiderable portion of a mean linen; and a duty

*See 1st report
made in 1784
woollen trade
was given up
to the linen
trade and
to us—*

*See 2d report
granted by law
on importation
of Irish linen
& the Duty
Foreign—*

duty, as inconsiderable, proportioned to what the Dutch paid, was laid upon those goods. Behold how things are now changed ! From the operation of this heavy duty in the English market, (the principal one, I apprehend, the Dutch had) the manufacture languished in Holland, and is now nearly extinct ; but the German and Russian manufactures, having laboured under no such burden, took place of the Dutch ; and our humane masters, the *British Parliament*, encourage their success, by leaving the duties as they had been at the time they were laid on ; so that instead of 30 per cent. which, by stipulation, the foreign manufacture should pay, I understand the duties in general do not exceed from eight to ten per cent. and there is a draw-back of the whole duty upon exportation. The consequence is, that the Germans and Russians are our rivals in England upon equal terms ; because the duty they pay is more than compensated in the cheapness of the raw materials at home ; and in our colonies, and other markets, to which the English export, the German and Russian linens find a bounty in the draw-back received at exportation. The bounty paid at exportation upon our linens is confined to those under eighteen-pence a yard ; so that we see even this small encouragement is limited.

Thus it appears, without going further into causes, of which there are many, that the want of the stipulated advantage, by the heavy duty on foreign linens, operates towards limiting the progress of the manufacture universally in Ireland ; and it accounts for the small proportion which Irish linens make of those brought into England.

Let

Let us now consider the second thing proposed; that is, whether England might not be able to obtain our sixth part of all she wants where she gets the remainder; and we shall find in this investigation, that a perfect security remains to us in the peculiar nature of the manufacture.

The usual errors, in thinking and talking on this subject, are,—First, that it is generally conceived that most of the linens which go to the English market are Irish; in short, that Ireland is the only linen country:—And, secondly, it is never considered that there is infinite variety in the manufacture of linen; so that nothing is more true than that two countries may live by exporting linen to the same market, without cause of jealousy. Every body acquainted with the manufacture knows, that the Irish fine linens are superior to those of all the world; whilst our coarse linens are miserably bad. The fact is, that we have improved the manufacture to a degree of refinement that injures its quality. Our spinners are of the first knack, and our bleachers in the same rank. The excellence of our first manufacture destroys the second.—Our coarse linens are manufactured of a part of the plant called *tow*, which is the residuum after drawing away all the finer parts for the first manufacture. This is what gives a preference to the Russian and German linens in market. They have no superior kind; and they work up all the flax into a coarse cloth, which is durable in the proportion of the quality of the stuff of which it is composed;—it resembles the household bread, from which, neither the fine flour has been taken, nor the bran; and they are both the object of ar-

tizens and hard-working people, who look for duration principally, in the commodity they buy.

Hence it is, that so much German and Russian linen comes to England; and I find, by examining the public accounts, for the amount of the drawbacks, that a very small quantity, comparatively, is exported of those linens; so that they are principally consumed in England.

By what I have said, my dear countrymen, you see that our manufacture stands very clear of the German. Our fine linens will stand alone, and must be bought, as long as luxury shall remain. A century will not bring any other country to the perfection of rivalry; and, if we sold our linens to the Dutch, French, or Spaniards, the English people of fashion must have them, even charged with a profit. As to our coarse linens, fortunately for us, they are fitted to a purpose which no other coarse linens will answer as well; I mean for STAMPING—a branch of trade so profitable to England, and for which the very infirmities of this manufacture give it such a preference, that they would likewise be obliged to buy it from strangers at any price, or give up their stamping business, should they think fit to break with us. The soft spongy texture of our coarse linen, makes it receive the stamp most successfully; and its lightness, flexibility and thinness fit it for women's use, and for hot climates.

The inattention of the English to our interest is very observable in a circumstance relative to this branch. The Irish linens, if stamped, forfeit their bounty at exportation, although German linen, if stamped, receives the drawback. From
this

this observation,—from the comparatively small quantity of our linens they buy,—from the consideration that they cannot get any where else the same linen, whether coarse or fine,—and from their inattention to altering the heavy duty from the Dutch to the German and Russian linens,—I think it is pretty clear that we owe them no obligation on the score of the linen manufacture; that they would not buy a single yard from us if it were not their advantage; and that we are morally certain of their custom, whether we quarrel with them or not. There are too many of their people who live by retailing our fine linens, as there are who live by the stamping business, to make it a safe matter for them to combine against our commodity, with which they cannot be supplied elsewhere. Our security is neither in their humanity nor in their love of justice.—It is in their self-interest, *the first principle of an Englishman.*

I apprehend they will not go to extremities. They might, to be sure, distress this country, as they have done the Colonies, and they would afterwards desire reconciliation, as they have done by those: But they would, in the experiment, certainly destroy themselves; for, though they should succeed in a struggle with this country, they would gain what would yield very little profit for many years.

I should never have done if I were to go through all the arguments, which concur to convince me of their inability to injure us. Stand firm, my friends, in the bond of union. The question is, Will you depend for ever on the sole support arising from one precarious, inconsiderable manufacture,

ture, or will you make an effort to obtain the advantages of many? The prize is worth contending for.

May 6. **GUATIMOZIN.**

P. S. I find in the Freeman's Journal of this day, [Thursday] by the enquiry before the Lords into the affairs of Greenwich Hospital, that all the sheeting is of Russian linen. Hence may you form a judgment of the encouragement extended by Ministers themselves to the manufacture of Ireland.

**TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING
THE FREE PRESS.**

LETTER V.

*To the PEOPLE of IRELAND, in general, and of
the CITY of DUBLIN, in particular.*

COUNTRYMEN, AND FELLOW-CITIZENS,

THE degree of attention with which my poor endeavours in the public cause have been lately honoured by you, exhibits a proof, that the accumulated oppressions of a powerful and merciless sister kingdom, although exercised in the extent of tyranny for more than a century, have not yet so completely broken down the spirit of this country as to leave us content with our miserable condition.

The

The last symptom of national abjection, *the apathy of the people*, is yet remote; and, perhaps, when the causes which have impaired a constitution naturally robust and vigorous shall be universally explored, our malady may find some means of relief.

The spirit of indignation, which at first incited me to labour in the public service, I confess, I considered somewhat allied to Knight-errantry, wherein the desire of succouring the oppressed is infinitely disproportioned to the means of accomplishing it; but, like the ancient professors of chivalry, I had sworn to persevere, although my mission should be attended with no other advantage than that of entitling me to be rewarded for my services by the thanks of *the lady in captivity*—the fate of many a courteous Knight.

Tarda sunt quæ in commune expostulantur, says Tacitus. The success however of the enterprize here is highly encouraging: the people are earnest in pursuit of the knowledge of their rights: and the means of accomplishing national justice appear at once effectual and mild. Passive resistance is compleatly suited to our condition; and I make no doubt that a very short period of time will demonstrate the wisdom of consuming, exclusively, our own manufactures, by the ease and comfort which employment will speedily give to our own people, and by the ruin our association will bring upon the staple commodity of our oppressors.

I have in my former letters nearly gone over the extent of ground laid down in my chart;—the present shall be employed in a review of the subject,

ject, and in the recollection of some materials which have escaped the first enquiry.

The right of Ireland to the advantages of her own legislation, and the injustice of binding her by the rules of any other, I believe, are demonstrated: but, what is much more substantial, it appears that the accomplishment of our relief from the usurpations of the English legislature, is practicable and safe. I say it is fortunate for us that the means of our emancipation are easy and in our power; because it appears evidently that we have nothing to expect either from the justice or the mercy of England.

The sources of wealth in every country are derived from the advantages of soil (in which is comprehended the quality of the surface of the earth, with what is contained in its bowels) the manufactures of the country, with the conveniencies of exporting them; and the fisheries belonging to the coasts of the country. From these materials, only, can human industry draw forth national wealth. It may not be unworthy of our attention to consider them with regard to Ireland. The enquiry may lead to discover the causes which have hitherto obstructed our prosperity.

Experience shews that the greatest advantages of soil, climate, and situation, and the most inexhaustible prolification in the fishing coasts of a country, will not accomplish the purposes of national prosperity without *manufactures*. We need not travel from Ireland to be *practically* acquainted with the fact, but the examples in aid of proof are numerous. The reason theoretically is clear and demonstrable.

demonstrable. Soil and climate are only advantageous in as much as they facilitate agriculture, the first source of wealth: But to what purpose will the farmer till the ground if there are not mouths to consume the produce? The abundance of his crop will frequently prove the very source of his misfortune. The idea of a nation of farmers is completely absurd; no country ever did, nor ever can exist as a granary for other countries; and although the export of corn may be a great source of wealth, in a country advanced, yet it is certain, that no people can arrive at such perfection in agriculture as to export considerably, but by the encouragement progressively afforded to the peasant, in a ready and certain market at home, for his grain. This source is ever found in manufactures; *those* require the mutual aid of a number of persons in concert with each other, and *they* must be fed. The farmer labours with alacrity, on account of the security of his market; and the communication with other countries, by the means of the manufactures, opens the way to a foreign market, to take off the redundancy of corn.

So delicate is the connection between agriculture and manufactures, that even the success of a country arising from the latter, is insecure where the former is neglected. This has been exemplified in the case of some great manufacturing cities, as Antwerp and Genoa, whose fall from the highest exaltation of commercial grandeur was occasioned by the insecurity, in the article of bread, which the inhabitants found in the want of a peasantry. In short, it is a fact not to be questioned, that agriculture and manufactures depend

D

mutually

mutually upon each other for support. As to mines, minerals, &c. which a country contains within its bowels, every body knows that the cultivation of those will not take place till manufactures shall have considerably advanced in a country. I speak not of mines of gold and silver,—the source of national ruin, not of prosperity.

The very same connection, which binds agriculture and manufactures in one common interest, will be found to apply between the fisheries and manufactures. The Dutch derive infinite wealth from the industry with which they explore the ocean in search of fish, but they abound above all nations in manufactures. Miserable indeed were the condition of a people reduced to this expedient alone for their prosperity!

From what I have advanced, my dear countrymen, it is clear that two of the three great sources of national wealth, *agriculture and the fisheries*, are totally cut off where the *third* is wanting. So that a country, the most fertile in its soil, with every advantage which can be derived from an equal climate and commodious situation, its coasts blessed with an inexhaustible variety of fish, and its inhabitants endued with the advantages of natural acuteness, may yet experience all the miseries of national distress, and be exposed to the frequent apprehension of FAMINE itself, for want of due application to manufactures. And, without changing the course of reasoning, it is also clear that a country having the advantages of fertility, of benign climate, and of fishing coasts, may establish her manufactures without any difficulty at all;

all; because the natural allies of manufactures are there already; and from the whole chain it is deducible, that it required a *malicious industry* on the part of Great Britain, by wicked management, to preclude Ireland from her natural claim to prosperity in *agriculture, manufactures, and fisheries*; the GREAT AND ONLY SOURCE OF NATIONAL WEALTH.

Let us examine the progress of this scheme against the prosperity of Ireland, and we shall see that the means by which it has been accomplished are worthy of the end proposed.

In 1698, when these countries were beginning to wear a new face, and when the advantages of manufactures were not as well understood as they are now; at a period too, when Ireland had, in an extraordinary degree, suffered calamities by two recently successive civil wars, the English adventurers in both of which were not unfrequently *reprimed* at the expence of the inhabitants of Ireland, to the no small insecurity of property here; let us consider what was the condition of manufactures in both countries. That the manufactures of Ireland were not behind those of England, is pretty evident from the preamble of the English A. & S. the 10th of William III: quoted by your ingenious correspondent *Confidicus*, and appears also plainly from the answer of King William to the requisition of the British Parliament upon that head.

" *Sabbati 2 die Julii, Decimo Gulielmi III.*

" *Gentlemen,*

" I shall do all in me lies to discourage the
" woollen manufacture in Ireland, and to promote the trade of England."

Now, if manufactures were so considerable there in Ireland, and that of wool particularly so far advanced as to rouse the jealousy of England, and to create fears lest their own should be overwhelmed by it, what may we reasonably suppose the condition of Ireland would be at this day, if it had experienced fair play? The answer is easy to any man who considers the superiority of her natural advantages. But mark what followed this *cold-blooded Dutch declaration*.—Effectual means were taken in the parliament of Ireland to blazon out the mutual advantages of a compact, whereby Ireland should enjoy "all the advantages and profit which "this kingdom can be capable of, from the linen "and hempen manufacture," and in consideration whereof she agreed to give up her woollen manufacture. Iniquitous as the imposition of this bargain was, for which Ireland gave up every thing, and England exchanged nothing but words, let us see how far England has even kept her word. They set themselves immediately to turning the whole bargain to their own advantage. They encouraged their own linen manufacture. It is true, they laid a duty on foreign linens, which operates against the foreigner, but they provided a drawback of the whole duty on exportation; that is, whenever this very foreign linen should become an article of commerce in the hands of an Englishman, he should, immediately and individually, at exportation, have a profit of the whole amount of the tax paid to the state by the foreigner, at importation. They got deeply into a most profitable manufacture of cheques; and in order to secure to themselves the exportation from Ireland of the yarn for this manufacture, (although nothing is

*See report on
William the 3^d
time to give up
the linen for
linen trade*

*See report on
linen*

*See report on
linen*

*See report on
linen*

*See report on
linen*

*See report on
linen*

so ruinous to a country as to export its raw materials) they forbid by a law the exportation of cheques from Ireland.—The same they did by printed and stained linens. When the weight of the foreign linen manufacture was transferred from Holland to the Baltic, they neglected to make a new valuation for the foreign linens, which has nearly ruined our linen trade. The bounty on exportation of our linen from England, is only equal to that of the English and Scotch, whereby their manufacture has an advantage over ours in a foreign market, by the expence of freight, factorage, risque, &c. &c. from this to England. They have, besides, taken care to reserve a profit upon us passing through their hands; for a man living in Dublin cannot carry his linens to England, export them thence himself, and receive the draw-back there:—The act particularly says, “that no person shall be entitled to the draw-back, but a person *bona fide* resident in England.”

They have a bounty of one half-penny per yard on the export of their cheques, amounting to about 15 per cent. upon the value of the Irish linen yarn, of which it is made; now this may fairly be said to operate as a bounty of 15 per cent. upon the exportation from Ireland of the raw materials of our staple manufacture.—The effects which that will produce in time may be easily conceived; and they talk of increasing this bounty up to three times the amount.

But all this is nothing, in barefacedness, compared to act 23 Geo. II. whereby they have annihilated, at one blow, a flourishing hempen manufacture.

facture in Ireland, which had been progressively improving for half a century, and the enjoyment of which to Ireland had been specially stipulated in the compact of 1698.

Thus has Great Britain, in the first instance, cajoled this country out of the benefit of universal manufactures, by holding out to her the exclusive advantages of the linen-manufacture; and in the second place she has broken every part of her agreement with Ireland concerning this very linen-manufacture. But there is another mischief entailed upon us in consequence of this infernal compact of 1698. The union with Scotland has given the people of that country a pretence of right, equal to that of the English, to live by the plunder of Ireland. The immense quantities of kentings and gauzes poured into this country annually from Scotland, and shamefully worn by the women of this country, are a part of our national reproach; and lest an Irishman should profit any thing by them, they send their own shop-keepers, who open warehouses here, and vend Scotch articles of the linen manufacture in every part of this city. I hope, when they shall return home, they will teach their *mobs* moderation, from the example of the mobs of this city, who suffer them to carry on this ruinous commerce, against the faith of England, solemnly pledged in parliament, and do not carry fire and desolation into their dwellings.

It is a ridiculous question to ask why they are able to undersell us in our own markets? A country, confined to a single manufacture, and to which that manufacture is dealt out experimentally, partially, and in detail, cannot succeed

succeed in any thing against a country possessed
 of the advantages of universal trade. But in truth,
 kentings and gauzes are not the most pernicious
 commodity imported from Scotland into this coun-
 try. The men of Scotland, who are over-running
 us universally, are infinitely more dangerous. — I am
 an enemy to national reflections, but when the
 people of an entire country are all marked with
 the same distinguishing features of character, the
 observation on them ceases to be called national
 reflection. These men have a propensity to emi-
 gration, and they carry with them into every
 country the vices of their own. Religious hypo-
 crisy, fervility of manners, and political depravity
 distinguish them from all the nations of the earth.
 The only satisfaction we have, is, that the prin-
 ciples of these Scotchmen in England have con-
 tributed very much to the ruin of the British em-
 pire. England has pledged us in the bitter
 draught.

But I perceive my paper swelling along with my
 indignation. — I shall now dismiss the subject of
 the linen manufacture, over which the means of
 my information have been exceedingly limited. I
 take this opportunity of returning public thanks
 for the assistance I have received from some pa-
 triotic gentlemen, of whose persons I am as ig-
 norant as they are of mine; particularly to a gen-
 tleman who left a packet directed for me, yester-
 day at the house of the publisher of the Freeman's
 Journal.

I have likewise acknowledgments to make to
 some persons who have made honourable mention
 of me, in published essays. One gentleman, under
 the

the signature of *Confidicus*, has twice favoured me with his company abroad. I should be proud of such a companion, if I did not entertain some suspicion, that by appearing in the modest guise of a *satellite*, he harbours the malicious design of eclipsing the primary planet. By *primary* I mean literally the order of time. The public, in my opinion, owes him much obligation. The acuteness of his judgment, and the closeness of his argumentation, leave no void space in the conviction of his readers.

And now, my dear countrymen, will you universally embrace the present occasion of a non-importation agreement, or will you wait until your oppressors, having accommodated matters with the French, and having given up the Americans, shall have leisure to force you to wear what cloaths they choose. Their moderate treatment of America, you may consider as an earnest of their future humanity towards you—*proximus ardet*—I once knew a drunken bully, who, in his intoxication, would frequently provoke his neighbours to threaten him, but who never failed to retaliate the blows upon his wife when he got home.

14th May.

GUATIMOZIN.

To

TO THE PUBLISHER OF THE FREE-
MAN'S JOURNAL.

LETTER VI.

HAVING received by the post your paper of April 24, I am perfectly at a loss to know either from whom, or for what intent it was sent me; but conceiving that it is meant in some measure to glance at my public conduct in respect to the propositions made in the course of the last and present sessions of parliament, for the relief of Ireland, and as I should wish to stand well in the opinion of the world, as well as of the Gentleman from whom I received the paper, shall esteem it as a favour if you will give this letter a place in your paper.—The initials of my name will be sufficient to satisfy the Person to whom it is chiefly addressed, and the public principles it contains, will shew the sentiments of the independent country gentlemen respecting our *sister kingdom*.

When Lord N——n made his propositions to Parliament, it was so late as some time in April, 1778.—Their extent and magnitude gave an immediate

mediate alarm to the whole kingdom—Scarce a manufacture that was not involved in them.—The impossibility from the late period of the sessions, of a thorough investigation, increased the apprehensions—and on being informed by the Minister that he was determined to pass them immediately, it became necessary to make the most spirited opposition; perhaps in the idea of the trading towns, to put an entire stop to the propositions ever taking place, but in that of the country Gentlemen, only to give a further time for considering the consequences of such an universal overthrow of the trade laws of the kingdom.

It was in consequence of such an idea, that we moved to put off the further proceeding till next sessions, at the same time proposing, that a committee should be immediately appointed to take into consideration the whole of the trade laws, subsisting betwixt the two kingdoms, which should in a future sessions be the ground-work of a lasting and equal new regulation, which should then be drawn for the mutual benefit of both.

This proposition was rejected by the Irish Gentlemen in the House with great contempt.—I dare say, their reason was a jealousy that nothing was meant by it but parliamentary craft, to get rid of the business by a side manœuvre, which we could not do by open force, and that they had not any intention of taking advantage of our fears, or compassion, by hurrying us into measures, of which we neither knew the extent, consequence, or propriety.

A fyster

A systematical opposition was now formed, and parliamentary forms and delays, were called in to our Assistance, (a measure I never approve of, when proper opportunity has been given of investigation, and which nothing but the precipitancy of the attempt would justify). After some time a sort of compromise was made, in which I need not say that part of the propositions were granted; part put off till a future session. As to my own share, as I did not quite approve the *kind* of opposition, I did not attend, nor assist any further than the first step, viz. of proposing the Committee.

Sir, I will venture to assert that the principles of the opposition to the propositions were not either *unjust* or *illiberal*.—Scarce a gentleman who did not avow a desire, nay a conviction of the necessity of giving every aid, every indulgence in his power to the inhabitants of Ireland, consistent with that policy, which ought by investigation to be the rule of the actions of a representative of the people.

But, Sir, I must at the same time declare that we were not equally convinced that the ruinous state of Ireland was to be attributed to the oppressions she laboured under from England.

Was it not rather to be attributed to its own internal bad policy?—Exhausted of its wealth by its absentees,—of that wealth, which by a judicious expenditure at home, would have increased its means—promoted cultivation—doubled its manufactures,—and enabled it to have traded with England, to an infinite greater extent, than in its late most affluent state.

Perhaps

Perhaps it may be said, that Ireland had great merit in providing pensions and sinecures for so many Englishmen, and assisting us in the American war.

In both these particulars I deny the claim of Ireland to any merit at all. In the first, it has only added means to that system of corruption, which, like a canker-worm, has gnawed the very vitals of the English constitution, for which we have no obligations.—In the second, it has interfered in a quarrel where it not only had no business, but where true policy, from the similarity of circumstances in which America and Ireland stand, should have made her rather a mediatrix of peace, than a party in war.—Your present associations for non-importation, are the truest comment on my assertion.

I might demand of Ireland, on what principles those associations are formed? America entered into them, because England violated all her just rights, by an open avowal of taxing or binding her by laws to which she gave no consent.—Ireland has entered into them, because England would not blindfoldly give up her clear, undisputed rights, to her own colonies, her own estates, in the West-Indies to which Ireland had no claim.

When the propositions were made in this session of parliament, I will freely own that I think the kingdom of Ireland was not used with that candour it ought to have been,—when the broad ground was rejected for a specific proposal. The specific proposal should have been accepted or at least fully investigated: but, as Lord North had

And the merit of rejecting this proposal, I am not bound to say more of it, than that it had my concurrence, from the circumstances in which it was introduced, though not quite convinced of its propriety.

To conclude, I am (and I believe I speak the language of the country gentlemen) perfectly a friend to the kingdom of Ireland, as a perfectly independent, but connected by alliance, kingdom; and wish for that kind of union which should say, One Interest, one Law, one King.

C. W.

**TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING
THE FREE-PRESS.**

LETTER VII.

To Sir CECIL WRAY, Bart. a REPRESENTATIVE of the BOROUGH of EAST REDFORD, in the BRITISH PARLIAMENT.

IT will not, I hope, Sir, be considered as any violation of those forms, to the observance of which gentlemen are bound by delicacy and decorum, that I presume to address you in this public manner, by your name, and at full length. The necessity of the occasion which prompts me will not be bound in the limitations of etiquette; and the dignity of sentiment which distinguishes your present

sent public appearance amongst us, sets you, in my opinion, very high above the level of ordinary ceremony.

An English country gentleman, the representative in Parliament of a free people, and the political guardian of a glorious constitution, finds that he cannot patiently bear the implication of a charge that he, whose duty binds him to the preservation of the liberties of his own country, should wantonly, or, what is worse, from motives of partiality and self-interest, annihilate the freedom of another country, equally entitled with his own to the advantages which God and Nature have scattered upon the face of the earth; and over which country he can rationally claim no right of control, that may not with equal justice be exercised over his own, whensoever the unerring progression of vicissitude shall arm a stronger Russian hand against it.

Impatience under so heavy a charge is natural to a noble disposition; and somewhat under the influence of this sentiment I presume you felt yourself, when you wrote, and sent into this kingdom, for publication, an essay, which appeared in the Freeman's Journal on Saturday last; in which you defend yourself against the imputation of **IL-LIBERALITY** and **INJUSTICE** in the vigorous parliamentary opposition given by you to some late attempts towards lessening the number of restrictions, imposed and continued upon the trade of Ireland, by laws of the British legislature.

Your condescension in pleading to your indictment at the bar of our tribunal, is an effort of

that national spirit of equality, which has ornamented the History of England with so many illustrious names; and your professions are so honourable and kind towards this country as to entitle you, independent of other considerations, to the best information in our power relative to it; the more especially as you profess to speak the sentiments of the *independent country gentlemen of England*, upon the subject.

The foundation upon which England claims a right to bind this kingdom, by laws of her legislature, unfortunately for us, has never been laid open.

Judge Blackstone says, "The original and true ground of this superiority is what we usually call, *though somewhat improperly*, the right of conquest; a right allowed by the law of nations, if not by that of nature; but which in reason and civil policy can mean nothing more than that, in order to put an end to hostilities, a compact is either, *expressly* or *tacitly*, made between the conqueror and conquered, that if they will acknowledge the victor for their *master*, he will treat them for the future as subjects, and not as enemies."

Let us put this indefinite jargon into precise language, and examine the extent and meaning of it.

Ireland, under a right of conquest, (*which fact, as to conquest, is nearly given up in the sentence, "though somewhat improperly"*) is become the property of England, to do with as she shall think fit; for, by a compact, *expressly* or *tacitly*, Ireland has purchased

purchased peace, by submitting to slavery. It is
 not a stretching either of sense or of language to
 translate his term "subjects" into the word slaves;
 for, his own conception of the relation between the
 conqueror and conquered, when applied to nations,
 and the example of what has happened between the
 two kingdoms, for which his theory is formed, jus-
 tify the construction. The learned Judge, after
 having laid this liberal foundation, goes on to
 build upon it, a superstructure, solid as the base;
 for he tells you, in the next passage, that, lest
 any doubt should arise upon the matter, it was
 declared, 6th Geo. I. c. 5. in the British legislature,
 that "Ireland ought to be subordinate to, and de-
 pendent upon the crown of Great Britain, and
 that the King's Majesty, with the consent of the
 "Lords and Commons of Great Britain in Parlia-
 "ment, hath power to make laws to bind the peo-
 "ple of Ireland." Here is a very extensive and
 valuable, but disputed right, decided by the au-
 thority and declaration *solely* of one of the parties;
 and the decision must be *just*, considering that the
 whole benefit of the decree, in which is involved
 the ruin of the other party, goes to the use and
 benefit of the Judge. And behold how magically
 and suddenly the crown of Great Britain is here
 changed into a multifarious body, consisting of
 the King's Majesty, and of the Lords and Com-
 mons of Great Britain? But when once the slave-
 ry of Ireland is secured by a British Act of Parlia-
 ment, Sir William Blackstone is too good a law-
 yer to question the legality of the act, or the com-
 petency of the enacting authority. What a pro-
 stitution of honour, of principles, and of talents!
 Yet this, in fact, contains the whole foundation
 of his "sovereign legislative power" of the Bri-
 tish

tish Parliament over Ireland. It were curious to know the source whence Sir William has drawn his legislative ethics. To you, Sir, it is plain, this reasoning has lost its weight; for in the end of your essay you confess that Ireland is a "perfectly independent, but connected by alliance, kingdom." It remains then only for your consideration to enquire how far a British senator, at this day, is exempt of the imputation of "illiberality and injustice," when he uses his parliamentary endeavours to continue restrictions, which deprive Ireland, as a nation, of every attribute of independency. And I am convinced, to a man of your good sense, it will require very little pains to prove that, when the legislature of Great Britain, by a strong hand, imposed legislative rules of conduct upon the people of Ireland, who were not represented in their Parliament, but who had at the same time a Parliament of their own, whose legislative rules, however incompatible with those of Great Britain, they were constitutionally bound to obey, it was an act suggested by **ILLIBERALITY** and executed with **INJUSTICE**. I do not manage terms when I speak of the actors in those transactions; for they are all dead. It becomes the duty of their successors, to consider whether or no they are not parties in the **ILLIBERALITY** and **INJUSTICE** of these acts, to which they not only continue to give operation, but which they refuse to repeal, although the **ILLIBERALITY** and **INJUSTICE** of them be made manifest.

In my letter of the 24th of April, to which yours has reference, and in some others, which have since been published here, this subject is so amply treated, and the plain fact itself is so obvious, that I consider it a waste of time and

pains to go farther into it; and will therefore confine myself to the matter of your essay. You say, Sir, that when the propositions for the relief of Ireland came before Parliament, "scarce a gentleman who did not avow a desire, nay a conviction of the necessity of giving every aid, every indulgence in his power to the inhabitants of Ireland, consistent with that policy, which ought, by investigation, to be the rule of the actions of a representative of the people."

A man unacquainted with the British system of Irish abjection, would be inclined to ask *what* people is meant here, when there is question of releasing, from bondage and misery, three millions of his MAJESTY'S LOYAL IRISH SUBJECTS.

Do you, as a British legislator, avow the influence of that policy, which would reduce to beggary three millions of THE BEST SUBJECTS in the empire, in order that double the number, in another part, shall derive superfluous wealth from their ruin? Let us examine this idea by the principles of Sir William Blackstone's *sovereign legislative power*.

As a sovereign legislator of Great Britain, Sir Cecil Wray takes upon himself the parliamentary care of the people of Ireland. If equal justice make any part of the character of a *British sovereign legislator*, I apprehend that Sir Cecil Wray is bound to be as tenacious of the rights of the people of Ireland, as he is of those of the inhabitants of East Redford.

Otherwise

Otherwise, this *sovereign legislative power* is a power instituted in partiality and injustice; I might add that it is insidious, treacherous, and ungenerous; inasmuch as this legislative care of Ireland is voluntarily undertaken, upon his part, without the requisition of the inhabitants.

In short, we must invert all the ideas, hitherto entertained of *legislative* authority, if we suppose that it confers the power of doing mischief, without the *concomitant essential injunction* to do good.

The British legislature, under such a supposition, would hold the same relation to Ireland, as the Devil is said to bear to mankind.

We are bound therefore to suppose, Sir, that when you talk of granting liberties to Ireland consistent with the rule which should govern the conduct of a representative of *the people*, you mean to include the people of Ireland in your legislative comprehension.

The thing is, logically, a perfect dilemma. Either you do comprehend them, and then you are bound as above; or do you not comprehend them, in which case the exercise of your *sovereign legislative power*, with regard to them, is UNJUST and ILLIBERAL.

A little lower you intimate that "you might demand of Ireland upon what principles those associations are formed." I will answer the question. The associations of the people of Ireland to consume, *exclusively*, their own manufactures, are formed upon the principles which suggested the

spirit and letter of the whole code of the trade laws of England. *A spirit of monopoly in favour of ourselves.* Is there a single manufacture of England, linen only excepted, that is not entrenched in prohibitory importation laws? The only difference between your associations and ours is, that yours is sealed by the *sovereign legislative authority*, ours by the consent and acclamation of three millions of people.

Your idea that we are angry because of the refusal of the proposition relative to rum and sugars, is not founded in the fact. There is no man of sense and liberality in this kingdom would have given sixpence to obtain what was demanded upon that score.—I wish the restrictions of England were directed towards the excluding us from all articles of luxury!

And here, Sir, I must remark to you that we have been, hitherto, very unfortunate in this particular. Scarcely any thing asked for us in your parliament would have been useful. I beg pardon, I had forgotten the *source of wealth we are likely to derive from the culture of Tobacco.*

The merit of maintaining English pensioners, and of assisting in prosecuting the American war, you have, Sir, generously given us, without any pretensions on our part to the credit of either. The pension list of Ireland is at once the reproach of British government, and a galling instance of Irish subjection.——The catalogue of panders, bawds, spies, and informers, German Generals, Scotch pedlars, foreign Ambassadors, and Jew Brokers, formeth the motley crew.

As

As to the American persecution, I can assure you, with great truth, that this whole nation, with a very few exceptions, were averse from it; nor can there be a more solid proof, than one that is now universally known, viz. that those armies, which you could not bear in America, consisted chiefly of Irish emigrants.

Addressees, I know, were procured here, the manner of obtaining which would have disgraced any administration, save only that one which accomplished them. The names of thousands who had never existed, and of many more who had never seen the addressees, were reverberated upon us in the *London Gazette*. Whilst the addressees of those, who sought to stop the effusion of kindred blood, were lost in their passage from us.

As to our Absentees, with whom you reproach us, we have only to answer that we should rejoice, if you would make a law to oblige them to stay at home; but their spending their money amongst you, seems a very odd argument against granting us the means to enable us to recruit that strength, of which we are deprived for your advantage.

Of the mode lately instituted, amongst you, to enquire into the causes of the present distresses of Ireland, I have an ill opinion—I am satisfied it is done for the purposes of procrastination, and deceit only. Three millions of people, whose eyes are newly opened on the abuse of their political rights, and whose distresses are urgent, appear rather formidable, at this time, to a British Minister. The ice-law, insidious oration, of the blasted *Malagrida*, in your house of peers, is well understood

understood in this country, of which he is known to be the secret enemy.

It is in vain that you affect to seek the proximate causes of the distress of Ireland. Those she suffers at present in common with the whole empire; and when you shall have discovered what it is, which now produces temporary distress in England, it will equally apply to us. But it is the remote cause which, operates perpetually against this country, and which, being removed, will still her complaints, and make her happy; I mean the restrictions upon her trade.

The removal of this cause is within your reach, and the operation will have unerring effects. How can you possibly suppose a great country, like this, to exist long upon the portion of a *single manufacture*. I will not call to mind how infamously we have been dealt with, even in this one. The national faith solemnly pledged in your *sovereign legislative parliament*, in 1698, together with the promise of the crown, were not sufficient to preserve to us entire, and uninvaded, even this poor pittance of support, for a whole kingdom.

You will ask how we have so long subsisted, and why we are clamorous now? The reasons are obvious. Distress has universally invaded the empire, the consequence of an impolitic civil-war, an alienated continent,—the former source of much wealth, and an impaired commerce. Money grows scarce, and Ireland is ruined; whilst Great Britain is only distressed; because a small matter is sufficient to ruin Ireland.

If one man, in a given number, has been kept for some time to a strict and spare diet, and if whilst he is upon this stinted diet, a general scarcity shall arise amongst the whole number; it requires no great sagacity to foresee, that he will famish before the others shall grow weak.

If you would see Irish grievances, turn over your statute book. Look for the word *Ireland*, or the word *Penalty*, 'tis equal which; for where you meet the first, the second inevitably follows; so that you may trace Ireland, through the code, as you track a wounded man through a crowd, by blood.

I would wish, Sir, in this place, to anticipate an argument very commonly used in favour of the claim of England, to uncontrouled power over Ireland. Say they, we protect you at an enormous expence; and pray what would become of you if we did not? I would to God they would try the experiment, and leave us to ourselves. They would soon find that with our *powerful friends* we should lose our *powerful enemies*. 'Tis on account of our connection with England, that we are threatened. Her protection of us has been eminent during the course of this war, when the privateers of our enemies perpetually insult our very ports.

The protection of England brings upon us the frequent alarm of invasions, and her wars have carried away those troops which, having been paid and cloathed by us, should, in justice, have remained here for our defence. England's protection of Ireland is as treacherous as is the shelter

of the exalted oak, in the thunder storm, to
the humblest clown, who seeks its shade.
The tree serves, but to conduct, more unerringly,
the lightning's force upon his head.

The policy of England, which keeps us rather
in a state of enmity than of friendship, is a nar-
row policy, and destructive of its own ends. —
Equal should it be to the British legislator, whe-
ther wealth flowed into the empire through Bristol
or Cork, London or Dublin. It would soon
diffuse itself, and find universal circulation.

The thorough-paced illiberality of a Scotch
pedlar, or the limited views of a Manchester
tradesman, confine them to the surface of things;
but the man who deviles laws for a great empire
should look deeper.

As to an union now with England, I confess
I am doubtful of its expediency. Time was that
it would have been a glorious proposition to Ire-
land—but to unite ourselves to the vices and the
decay of England, when her prosperity has taken
flight with her virtues, is an experiment of which
no man can promise good consequences.

The sun of England is nearly set, but in its
meridian height it was to poor Ireland a winter-
sun, the oblique direction of whose rays deprived
us of the advantages which we should have deri-
ved from its proximity.

July 3.

GUATIMOZIN.

To

TO THE PUBLISHER OF THE FREE-
MAN'S JOURNAL.

LETTER VIII.

NOT choosing to enter the lists of a literary war with your correspondent GUAYMOZIN, to whose real name I am utterly a stranger, but desirous of a clearer explanation of my motives for my Parliamentary conduct, than my last seems to have conveyed to him; I must once more beg your indulgence for the following lines in your paper, unless you will more fully oblige me by transmitting them to him, for whom they are principally intended.

And, first, I detect and abhor that dangerous, anti-constitutional, tyrannical position of the English law, that "Ireland ought to be subordinate to, and dependant on the British Crown, and that the King's Majesty, with the consent of the Lords and Commons of Great Britain in Parliament, hath power to make laws to bind the people of Ireland."—Sir, I ever opposed such a position in respect to America; I will ever oppose it in respect to Ireland.

But, Sir, I have always been taught, that every branch of the British empire should contribute to the wants of the whole,—that this must either

either be done by an actual taxation of the branches, or (should that be found impracticable) by such a monopoly of the trade, as should enable the *body* of the *empire*, viz. Britain, to contribute not only its *own share*, but that of the respective branches not contributing.

On this principle I apprehended the Legislature of Great Britain had a superintending care over the Trade Laws of the whole empire; and, as such, that it was the peculiar duty of every Representative of the People not to consent to their abolition, without the fullest investigation.

As a proof that this was the sentiment of gentlemen who gave their opposition to the Irish propositions, the question was often put to their supporters, If they would consent, that, on an equality of trade being granted to Ireland, Ireland should pay an equality of taxes? in which case its quota would arise from *taxation*, and not from *monopoly*.—The constant answer was,—No,—Ireland cannot afford to pay so great a burthen on her trade as England does.

I apprehend myself to be the actual Representative of Great Britain alone, and that *virtual* representation is a name invented by those who wish by sophistry to impose on the common sense of mankind, if by it any more is meant, than a representation of many, who, though they are not ranked amongst the Electors, yet are connected in one common interest, and liable to the same benefits and impositions from the Legislature, as those are to whom the care of electing is trusted by the laws.—By this definition, I do not look
on

on myself as the Representative of Ireland, and, for myself, utterly disclaim that sovereign legislative power, farther than I have before stated, and which Ireland admits by a thousand applications and regulations.

I do readily agree, that Ireland has been unfortunate in the propositions made in her favour not being useful to her. Is then the rejection of useless favours an article of accusation on which to found a separation?—As for *Wolfe*, I should as soon have thought of giving them a power to grow *sugar*, which I believe would have been full as efficacious in removing her distresses. At the same time, denying the power of England to prevent Ireland, by any law, from growing hemp either.

In speaking of the pensions on Ireland, I mean, that, if it is an act of State, and not of Parliament, still the Representatives of that country, by holding the purse, have power to forbid such a misapplication.—'Tis so far then an act of the people of Ireland. On the same footing may be considered the assistance given to England in the prosecution of the American war. To the Minister be all the merit of the ADDRESSES, GAZETTES, and MISINFORMATIONS.

The policy of Britain towards Ireland, has always appeared to me weak, selfish and tyrannical.—Whenever it is proposed to alter such conduct, by probing to the bottom its wounds—should it then be my lot to represent a borough on the terms I do at present, viz. the most generous and constitutional to my constituents, the most flattering and

and honorable to myself (and on no other will I
ever find myself) justice to Ireland, and policy to
Britain. Shall make me ever one of the most
ready in giving my assistance to so salutary a
purpose.

To conclude; when I see your great men im-
mersed in dissipation and foreign extravagance,—
your commons in idleness, and a total want of in-
dustry,—a part of the people in a spirit of perse-
cution that would do honour to a *Conclave*, and
the rest in bigotry and superstition, which would
not have disgraced the followers of *Lama*—
—a want of political economy in your
rulers—fervility in your courtiers—a readiness to
be corrupted in your patriots, which even an Eng-
lish House of Commons might blush at, I have
little hopes of your ruin being prevented.—If
the picture is not just your own writers must
answer for it, as from them I have drawn my
copy—remove these evils, the effects, ruin, po-
verty, and distress, will soon cease.

application — I do not then act of the people
of Ireland. On the same footing may be con-
sidered the assistance given to England in the pro-
tection of the American war. I to the Minister
be all the merit of the Address, *Gazettes*
and MINISTERS.

The policy of Britain towards Ireland, has al-
ways appeared to me weak, selfish and tyrannical.
—Whenever it is proposed to alter such conduct,
by probing to the bottom its wounds—should it
then be my lot to represent a borough on the
terms I do at present, viz. the most generous and
valuable to my constituents, the most flattering
and

LETTER IX.

TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING
THE FREE-PRESS.

GENTLEMEN,

AMONG the several moral objects of examination, to which your correspondent GUATIMOZIN has called the public attention, perhaps no one can contribute more to rectify opinion, than the subject of the first sentence in his second letter, in which he says, that "his opponents would willingly stop all inquiry by the interposition of the single cabalistical word REBELLION." I own, Gentlemen, that when I read this sentence first, I was something shocked to see a word, which I had hitherto considered as expressive of the highest crime in society, treated with apparent lightness. But, the consideration of the tendency of his letter soon discovered to me that his ridicule was justly pointed—not at the meaning, but at the perversion of the term. Now, lest some of your readers should have felt the same shock that I did, without meeting with the same relief, a short attempt to ascertain the ideas which ought to be annexed to the term REBELLION may be of advantage to many; particularly at this day, as I understand a certain great legal authority has hinted a latitude in the application of this term, which the common law of the land and the common sense of the people must deny. And let not an inquiry

* Mr. J—e R—b—n.

into the abuse of a word he thought trivial, after it has been said by that sagacious observer, *Locke*, "that he, who will consider the errors and obscurity, the mistakes and confusion, that are spread abroad in the world by an ill use of words, will find some reason to doubt whether language, as it has been employed, has contributed more to the improvement or hindrance of knowledge amongst mankind."

The dictionary interprets the word REBELLION, "an insurrection against LAWFUL authority." An interpretation which, I believe, no man, who speaks candidly, and thinks accurately, will hesitate to admit; and under this meaning is certainly included an idea of criminality. Will any man now say, that a body of men, legally assembled, associating to wear the manufactures prepared by their relations, their friends and their neighbours, in preference to those sent to them by men whose intercourse with them is contempt, and whose government of them is oppression, has any tendency towards "an insurrection against LAWFUL authority?" Will it be said, that an association of men to exercise themselves in the use of arms, which by the positive expressions of their own laws, they are entitled to wear, has any tendency towards "an insurrection against LAWFUL authority?" If it should be demonstrated, from the authentic records of a kingdom, that certain restrictions by which it has been impoverished, are imposed in direct contradiction to the municipal laws of that kingdom, to the ancient faith of nations, and to the natural rights of mankind, will any man be daringly absurd enough to assert, that he who demonstrates these things has

has any tendency towards "an insurrection against LAWFUL authority?" If one nation should *judiciously* exercise over another, with which it had existed for centuries on terms of *equality* and unanimity, a controul violent and unprincipled; and insult it by declarations of a right to do so; and if that nation, so oppressed and insulted, should at last rise to assert its own laws, and enjoy its own property, will any man then say that such a rising would be "an insurrection against LAWFUL authority." To put the question, Gentlemen, concisely and finally, will any man involve himself in the perplexity of asserting that an opposition to an authority ILLEGALLY exercised, is an opposition to a LAWFUL authority? If he will not assert this, he must admit that not one of the acts which have been now supposed, includes REBELLION, or any tendency towards it. Yet, Gentlemen, it is a melancholy truth, that the history of mankind affords numberless instances of the misapplication of the term REBELLION, to such acts as I have just now stated. It is the art of tyrants and usurped governments, which has prevailed to gain the assistance of honest but unthinking men, by persuading them that every resistance to their domination was insurrection, and every insurrection REBELLION.

If what I have said shall rectify the opinion of any one man who reads it, let him owe his knowledge to the author of *Guatimozin*. I read his essay with unusual attention. If it did not convince me, it roused me. If it did not direct me *what* to think, it instructed me *how* to think. — When Bacon had gone so far "in the service of mankind,

mankind, even his ardent genius subsided. Until I
 had read his essay, like the old man in the comedy, I
 was ignorant of the value of the latter, and the truth of the
 former had been proved already by their industry,
 and that my course here was to enjoy both with-
 out labour or enquiry. But your correspondent
 has induced me to think that, as an Irishman, I
 may be poor in the revenue of the one, and ig-
 norant in the knowledge of the other.

CAUSIDICUS

LETTER X.

TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING THE FREE-PRESS.

GENTLEMEN,

IN my last, I endeavoured to rescue from the
 perversion of a prerogative lawyer, the word re-
 bellion. In this I shall endeavour, to apply to the
 government of an English Parliament, the word
 tyranny. That a learned Judge should pervert a
 legal term, that an English Parliament should vio-
 late

late the liberty of its fellow-citizens, are strong assertions. Yet, as I understand the truth of the first position has already been acknowledged, the demonstration of the other shall not be delayed. To demonstrate the last assertion, I must admit that power to be lawful, which your correspondent *Guatimozin* has proved to be usurped—the dominion of the English Parliament over the kingdom of Ireland.

If, then, the dominion of this *sovereign legislative* Parliament (to adopt the pomposity of Justice Blackstone) be admissible, it stands in a sovereign legislative relation to all parts *equally*, where it is *equally* admitted; that is all and every part, acknowledging *equally* its sovereign legislative power, are entitled *equally* to the good resulting from that power: I say to the good, because a sovereign legislative power to do other than good, that is a sovereign legislative *right* to do *wrong*, is an absurdity not to be confessed in this century. To illustrate this theory by a practical instance: If the English parliament assert a right to bind England *in all cases whatever*, and if they also assert a right to bind Ireland *in all cases whatever*, they stand precisely in an *equal* relation of power to both countries; and, consequently, standing in an *equal* relation of power to both countries, both countries must be *equally* entitled to an *equal* degree of liberty or restraint: therefore, every deviation from that equal degree of liberty or restraint must be a *violation of right*. In a despot, where action is produced most frequently by sudden gusts of passion, a violation of right, if we look gently on human infirmity, may sometimes be forgiven: but,

F

in

in a parliament, where every action must be preceded by the forms of *debate* and *reasoning*, a violation of right may be called a **DELIBERATE OPPRESSION**; and, a **DELIBERATE OPPRESSION** being the most perfect definition which the practice of governments ever gave to the word **TYRANNY**, should not, nor cannot be forgiven.

—*Longum iter est, per praecepta; breve et efficax, per exempla.*

My countrymen, I shall therefore call your attention to one statute of the English code of oppression, enacted for this kingdom.

British Statute
10 & 11 Wm 3
The British statute 10th and 11th William III. c. 10. declares, that “ Forasmuch as wool and woollen manufactures of cloth, serge, bays, &c. &c. are the greatest and most profitable commodities, on which the value of land and the trade of the nation do chiefly depend; and whereas great quantities of the like manufactures have of late been made, and are daily increasing in the kingdom of Ireland, &c. and are exported from thence to foreign markets, heretofore supplied from England, &c. for prevention whereof—the statute enacts, that no wool, woollen goods, serge, &c. &c. shall be exported, under the pains and penalties of confiscation, imprisonment, and, in another confirming statute, of transportation.

Now, I will suppose any supreme legislature had discovered that the industry of its subjects was daily increasing, that they were exporting the fruits of

of that industry to *foreign markets*, and that they were bringing home the wealth and the connections of those markets; I will suppose that, upon such a discovery, this supreme legislature should direct its subjects to stay their industry, and renounce their connections, and should ordain the pains and penalties of imprisonment, confiscation, and transportation, for their disobedience; I will suppose that this prohibition extended only to *one part* of the subjects of this supreme legislature; and that this prohibition was farther aggravated to that one part, by its being avowedly done to gratify and favour the other part.

Now, I will ask the man, whose leisure and whose capacity has enabled him to traverse the wide extravagance of civilized oppression, when a prohibition is extended only to one body of subjects, and at the same time is directly and avowedly intended to gratify another body of subjects; where both bodies stand in the same relation of power to the sovereign legislature, is not such a prohibition a *violation of rights*? And if that violation of right is preceded by the forms of debate and reasoning, is it not a **DELIBERATE OPPRESSION**? And is not a **DELIBERATE OPPRESSION** the most perfect definition which the practice of governments ever gave to the word **TYRANNY**?

Gentlemen, I have done. On a future day, a further comment on this extraordinary statute shall be given. On that future day, I trust to prove, that the fabric of oppression can only be founded on folly, and cemented in cruelty.

CAUSIDICUS.

LETTER XI.

TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING
THE FREE-PRESS.

GENTLEMEN,

IN my last, I explained to the people of this country, the *deliberate oppression* exercised over them by the English parliament since the statute 10th and 11th William III. I then pledged myself to continue a comment on this extraordinary statute. And I trust the strong lines of folly and cruelty, which distinguish the hardened features of this act of oppression, will not require a microscopic vision in my readers to discern.

The preamble of the statute 10th and 11th William III. c. 10. declares, as was mentioned in my last, but is necessary to repeat here, "that forasmuch as wool and woollen manufactures of cloth, serge, bays, &c. &c. are the greatest and most profitable commodities, on which the value of lands, and the trade of the nation do chiefly depend; and whereas great quantities of the like manufactures, have of late been made, and are daily increasing in the kingdom of Ireland, and are

are exported from thence to foreign markets, heretofore supplied from England, which will inevitably sink the value of lands, and tend to the ruin of trade and the woollen manufactures of this realm; for PREVENTION whereof, &c. no person, &c. shall directly or indirectly, &c. ship off or export any wool, woollen manufactures, drapery, stuffs, &c. (S. 11.) under the penalty that all and every offender, &c. shall be subject to the respective pains, penalties, and forfeitures, hereafter, &c. that is forfeiture of ship, &c. and of 500*l*. for every offence, and of 40*l*. by every boatman, porter, &c. assisting in carrying, &c."

Permit me now to put the spirit and the principles of this preamble, and these penal clauses into a fair point of view for the good people of Ireland, and if, in attempting it, I shall falsify that spirit, or those principles, I give up all claim to public attention. I say then, that a sovereign legislature asserting a right to bind its dominions in *all cases whatever*, is answerable in all cases whatever for the prosperity or misery of the people contained within its sovereignty: and that wisdom will be the praise, and folly be the satire pronounced upon it, according to the degree of prosperity or misery accruing from its laws.

While I put into sovereign *legislative language* the certain consequences deducible from the positions laid down in this statute, mark its wisdom in its intended effects.

"Forasmuch as wool and woollen manufactures of cloth, serge, bays, &c. are great and profitable commodities, on which the value of lands, and the

the trade of nations, where the materials for such manufactures are produced must chiefly depend; and whereas great quantities of the said woollen manufactures, &c. have of late been made, and are daily increasing in our dominions, [Ireland] and are exported to foreign markets, which will inevitably raise the value of lands, extend the trade, and increase the population of this our realm of Ireland, for prevention *whereof*, all and every person *offending*, by attempting to aid this rise on the value of lands, this extension of trade, and increase of population, shall be subject to the pains and penalties of imprisonment, confiscation, &c.

Has it ever been held wisdom in a legislature to encrease the trade, the numbers, and the wealth of its people? If so, is not such a prevention folly? And did the folly of sovereignty ever stalk in such glaring robes as this deliberate folly of the English Parliament? But it will be said, perhaps, that however foolishly this Parliament may have acted to Ireland, they were moved towards it by a particular bias; and that they had a superior interest to guard, the vein of which will effectually vindicate their determinations from the charge of folly. Be it so! — The folly of such a prevention subsists in its effects, though denied to belong to the English Parliament. For if, from any bias, or superior interest, it should not appear to be folly in them to enact such laws, must it not be folly in any nation to endure a Legislature so biased and so interested?

Inconsistency is but a modification of folly; and the consistency of this wise Parliament shall be displayed

played by contrasting the preamble of another statute with the one just now mentioned.

The 13th Car. II. recites, "For the better preventing all such losses as have happened to the kingdom of England and dominion of Wales, and to the kingdom of Ireland by the subtil and secret exportation and transporting of wool, woollens, &c. (other the raw commodities) and for the better setting on to work the poor people and inhabitants of the kingdoms aforesaid, [Ireland] and to the intent that the full use and benefit of the principal and native commodities of the same kingdom [Ireland] may come and be unto the subjects and inhabitants of the same; [Ireland] and not unto or amongst the inhabitants of the realm of Scotland, or any other foreign realm or state. No person within the said dominions of Ireland, Wales, or England, shall export the said raw commodities, under the penalties contained in the said Act."

By the preamble of this last statute, the avowed motive of its restrictive clauses appears to be the better setting on to work the poor inhabitants of the kingdom, (amongst them Ireland) and that they shall not be deprived of the benefit of working up their native commodities: and by a necessary consequence, that they shall be encouraged (in Ireland as well as in England) to raise the value of their lands, to extend their trade, and encrease their population. Now, mark the consistency of this sovereign legislative Parliament! By the Act of Charles, we are prohibited from exporting our raw commodities, in order that we may find employment at home in manufacturing. By the Act
of

12th Charles
the 2^d -

of William, we are prohibited to use or enjoy that manufacture, which by the other we are encouraged to prepare. Is not this inconsistency? And can inconsistency in a sovereign legislative Parliament take a milder term than *folly*?

The Parliament of Charles *usurped* a power over Ireland, which, although they *usurped*, they exercised in *this* statute for wise and beneficent ends. The Parliament of William following the precedent of usurpation, exercised their power in *every* statute relating to Ireland, to attain ends which could only be sought by folly, and suggested by inhumanity. The comparison of these statutes adds one example more to the many which history affords, where the worst precedents were established in the best causes; and where the very *present utility* of the end sanctified the *future mischief* of the precedent.

I have now gone through the folly which floats upon the *surface* of this statute. To develop the *body* will require another day. When that body comes to be displayed, it will appear to maintain its solidity by the combination of numberless separate atoms of *cruelty*, all mutually attracted and supported by each other.

CAUSIDICUS.

LETTER XII.

TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING
THE FREE-PRESS.

GENTLEMEN,

HAVING finished, in my last letter, my observations on the *folly* of the English statute William III. c. 10, the original plan which I proposed wants nothing towards its execution, but to shew the cruelty by which the folly of that statute has been carried into oppressive execution. Sect. 3. of that act enacts, that no acquittal, indictment, &c. (*unless the offender be thereupon CONVICTED*) in Ireland, for any offence provided against in this act, shall be pleaded or allowed in bar or delay of any indictment, information, suit, or prosecution, within the kingdom of England. —Sect. 20. same act enacts, That every person may be prosecuted for any offence within this act, in the courts of Westminster, and, upon a capias issuing out of any such court, the person prosecuted shall be obliged to give good and sufficient bail of natural-born subjects, &c. By 3 G. I. c. 21. it is enacted, That, for the better and more impartial trial of the aforesaid actions and informations, they shall be tried in any of his Majesty's four-courts

courts at Dublin, by a jury, &c. to be summoned out of any *other* county than that, wherein the fact shall be committed. By 5 G. I. c. 11. All wool, &c. laid near the sea, or any navigable river, shall be forfeited.

It was once a principle of penal law here, that no man should be tried *above once* for the same offence. The iniquity of the affirmative of such a rule is so glaring, that no governments, even the most arbitrary, save only this sovereign legislative parliament, have attempted it. It was once a principle of constitution here, that every offence should be tried by the neighbourhood of that place where it was committed. The blessing of such a constitution is so evident, that no country, even the most insensible, save only Ireland, ever *quintly* surrendered it, after it had been known and enjoyed. But, now, view the sum of Irish liberty and English justice aggregated in these clauses.—An Irishman shall be tried in Ireland by a jury, summoned out of any *district* in the kingdom which the *prosecuting* party shall nominate: And it is a known fact, that the crown could by this power try a *forfeiture* cause by a jury of *custom-house officers*. But if, through the influence of some undiscerned spark of integrity remaining unsmothered by the profession of these officers, he should be acquitted, he shall be afterwards seized in the *free realm* of England, and confined in a common prison, unless he can find ample bail in a country where he must be considered a stranger: he shall be again tried in that country where he lies an unfriended stranger, for an offence

fence not alledged to be committed within 500 miles distance; and, if his circumstances will not permit him to bring witnesses, from that distance of 500 miles, to disprove his guilt, his goods shall be confiscated, he shall sustain a heavy fine, and his person shall be imprisoned. But farther: If within a limited time his unconfiscated property shall not answer the inflicted fine, "he shall be transported to the plantations." So that, in this last clause, his poverty, which in every other country would be considered a mitigation, becomes an aggravation of his transgression. And, by the clause in 5 G. I. in the wantonness of power, they carry their tyranny to our very doors: for, by that statute, a gentleman of Ireland, if he should happen to reside within their idea of the words bear to the sea or any navigable river, dare not lay the produce of his own demesne at the door of his own house, under penalty of forfeiture. A wretch, born to slavery and to poverty, unconscious of affluence and of freedom, is not such an object of compassion, as the man who, having grown to maturity in the enjoyment of the latter, is precipitated by violence or by perfidy to the lowest stage of the former. Yet this is the state of Ireland: And this precipitation, from its ancient rights, I call the cement of *cruelty*, which binds the fabric of *oppression* raised over it by the hands of *folly*.

I have, now, Gentlemen, dragged the Cacus from his den. Though I use this metaphor, I do not boast an Herculean labour—the house of civil tyranny was more easily attained than the cave of savage depredation: for through the intricacies
of

of English law the gradation of Ireland may be traced, as the way of a wounded man, by the blood which follows it. But, though the monster is brought to light by a single strength, it is only in the activity of the many to hunt him *even unto the death*. To speak in plainer terms, it is in the people only, and the people *united* in their efforts, to rid themselves of the tyrannic disposition in this *sovereign legislative parliament*. Against any attempts towards gaining such an union of efforts in the people, I am sensible many arguments will be urged. The probable danger of the means will terrify those who acknowledge the certain utility of the end. In truth, I apprehend this last sentence contains the amount of all that can be said against the attempt to gain our rights. If, therefore, it can be demonstrated that from the *peculiar nature* of the dominion which England has raised over Ireland, an end certainly useful can be attained, by means not probably dangerous, none even among the most timid will, I hope, hesitate to apply those means. — This is not the dominion of armed Rome, strong from her discipline, and from her *poverty independent* in that strength: England may be said to be armed, and strong from her discipline; but her arms and her discipline are *dependent* on her *wealth*. Arms and discipline only could conquer Rome; but a deprivation of *wealth* would subdue England. If America had not *chosen* to proceed by violence, she might have emancipated herself without a blow. The dominion of England over Ireland is England's *profit*, not her *glory*. Remove that *profit*;—her dominion becomes a sound. But, how, remove that

that profit? *Wear your own manufactures*; ASSOCIATE. By that word, she may be beaten without fighting, and subdued without contest. Thus the ends of war may be attained by the instruments of peace.

As the power of England is supported by her wealth, and as that wealth is accumulated by commerce, and as her trade with Ireland *now* contains a principal part of that commerce, Ireland may be said to hold *the key* of such a proportion of her wealth as her trade of Ireland bears to her universal trade. Ireland then stands as to England, for so much wealth, precisely in the same relation that the house of commons of England, stands to the crown of England. The crown is powerful, if the commons grant supplies; nevertheless, without that grant, let Ireland cease her consumption of English manufactures, the cause of that *profit* which is the essence of this dominion, and the power of England, like the *anarmid* hand of Majesty, can *terrify* only in its name.

CAUSIDICUS.

LET-

TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING
THE FREE-PRESS.

LETTER XIII.

To Mr. Justice R. — — — — — one of the Judges

of his Majesty's Court of King's Bench

in Ireland.

SIR,

ON Monday last you were pleased to interrupt

the business of the court of K. B. in order to cen-

sure the High Sheriff of the city of Dublin,

whom you accidentally saw then in court, for

what you were pleased to call his *misconduct* in con-

vening the sessions of Dublin, previous to their

entering into resolutions to consume exclusively

the manufactures of this kingdom. You thought

proper to declare on that occasion, that such a

convening, on the part of the Sheriff, was acting

contrary to his duty, and that the assembly, so con-

vened by him, was an *unlawful assembly*. Sir, I

regard the regularity with which the business of

the public should proceed, too much, to question

in a news-paper, the judgment of a court of jus-

tice pronounced in a cause *at hearing* before it.

If such a judgment should be grievous, there is

a better remedy than that of censoring it in a pub-

lic paper.—But, the attack made by you, on the

High

High Sheriff was not a judgment of a court of justice, "but an obiter opinion of J—— R———". The legal foundation upon which you rest your opinion, that the Sheriff acted contrary to his duty, when he convened the aggregate body, which hitherto has been done at the requisition of a certain number of the Freemen, I suppose you will explain, and I think it is your duty to do so: First, because your doctrine, delivered last Monday, contradicts the commonly received opinions of the public upon this head; secondly, because you have (however extrajudicially) delivered this opinion under the exercise of an authority which constitutionally belongs to your court, and should therefore be supported by law; and, most of all, because I do declare to your fellow-citizens, that the opinion which you then delivered has no foundation either in the common law, or in the statutes.

Whatever is not forbidden by law may legally be done. The Sheriff is not forbidden to convene the Freemen, therefore the Sheriff in so doing does not act contrary to his duty. It lies upon you to shew *where* the Sheriff is forbidden to convene his fellow-citizens. His authority to call them together is established by immemorial custom, as well as by the nature of his office. If Freemen may legally assemble, their public officer surely is the Sheriff, and as he is the "keeper of the King's peace," he can be no where more constitutionally employed than in regulating or superintending the proceedings of his fellow-citizens, assembled together for the purpose of constitutional discussion.

But

But you went further; you declared the Aggregate Body *an unlawful assembly*.

Lord Coke says, "An unlawful assembly is when three or more do assemble to do an *unlawful act*." 3 Inst. 176.

The intent of the parties here obviously constitutes the crime; otherwise a dozen people going to church, if any accident happened, might be deemed from the beginning an unlawful assembly. Now it rests with you to prove that it is an *unlawful act*, for three or more Irishmen to resolve to consume the manufactures of their brethren, kindred, and friends, in exclusion of the manufactures of their enemies and oppressors. If you cannot prove this, it follows that the intent which brought together lately the Aggregate Body was *lawful*, their assembly *lawful*, and your extrajudicial opinion *was not law*.

But it is expedient likewise that you inform the public what is, and what is not, an unlawful assembly of the people; for, by your indefinite, *extrajudicial* censure, it would seem that the people can never assemble *lawfully*.

I will suppose a case, extremely grievous indeed, and I will beg your opinion upon it, as you are so willing to give it *extrajudicially*:—Suppose a Barrister, to have made his way to a seat on the Bench of the criminal judicature, by means highly suspicious, not to say odious to the people, viz. by having flattered the power of the Crown in a prerogative pamphlet; and suppose this Judge, during

during a series of years, to have employed what little talents God gave him to the perversion of all legal principles, the violation of all private right, and to the disgrace of public decorum.—Suppose him a man whose malignity is only bounded by the narrowness of his capacity, and whose cruelty finds no limits but in the weakness of his power; a man who, in the place of the steady temper of liberal justice, has substituted the uncertain peevishness of disappointed ambition; and for the sound discrimination of a British Lawyer, has constantly displayed the craft and involutions of a *Jesuit*.—A man who has been observed to be always negligent, except when roused by anger; and undiscerning, but when he is sharpened by malice.—One who, while he followed the profession of a Lawyer, was too much despised by the people to be employed by them; and who never appeared as an *Advocate*, until he became a *Judge*.

If a man, answering to this description, should have unfortunately found his way to the seat of criminal jurisdiction; and if the people (after a waste of 22,000*l.* paid him in salary, and a toleration of him for twenty-one years, in which they vainly hoped that experience might have enlarged his understanding, and age might have moderated his passions) should find at last that experience had only taught him new methods of gratifying the malice which his years now rendered capricious; and of indulging a system of peevishness, which infirmities had made constant in him;—I desire to be informed by Mr. J—— R——, if, in such a dilemma, the people would not be
G justified,

justified, should they meet to instruct their parliamentary representatives to procure the constitutional removal of such a man; and if, in such case, he would venture to call the Aggregate Body an *unlawful Assembly*?

CAUSIDICUS.

T H E E N D,

6 DE 58